

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, and 11-14 have been amended. New claim 15 has been added. Claims 1-15 are currently pending.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 10-11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,162 (Edlund) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,847 (Stier).

Edlund is directed to a system and method that associates a label and description with a search query such that the query, label, and description can be stored in shared query repository to allow queries to be retrieved by multiple users for reuse. The shared query repository can be searched so that an appropriate query can be located and retrieved.

Stier is directed to an entity's operational performance and involves monitoring use of its knowledge by measuring use of a knowledge base storing its knowledge and monitoring knowledge that it generates by evaluating knowledge quality and efficiency of its generation. According to Stier, when an agent recognizes that her query represents missing, incorrect, or incomplete knowledge in the knowledge base, before saving the interaction, she may create a memo outlining the problem with the knowledge base and suggesting the knowledge that should be added to the knowledge base.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, and 13 are patentable over Edlund in view of Stier, as neither Edlund nor Stier, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests, "said know-how information being requested from a user in response to the input number measured at the end of the search processing exceeding a predetermined threshold value."

The Examiner acknowledges that Edlund does not explicitly disclose a unit for receiving an input of a message as in the present invention. On page 3 of the Office Action, however, the Examiner alleged that Stier discloses the feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that in contrast to the present invention in which the information is requested from a user *in response to* the "input number" exceeding a threshold value, Stier discloses that the memo is created by the agent in response to the agent's recognition that the query represents missing information. See Stier, column 8, lines 56-60. Therefore, in contrast to the present invention, Stier does not disclose requesting know-how

information in response to a number exceeding a threshold value. In fact, Stier teaches away from the present invention, as creating a memo in response to a user's recognition of a problem is a completely different method of processing trouble with searching a database than that of the present invention.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 11, and 13 are patentable over the references. As new claim 15 recites language similar to that of independent claim 1, for example, new claim 15 is patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claim. As dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, and 10 depend from respective independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

As Birkhoelzer and Dettinger add no relevant information to the cited combinations of references, claims 4, 9, 6, 12, and 14 are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented above.

In light of the foregoing, all claims are allowable over the cited combinations of references.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5-1-07

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501